R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 937 24 AA 000 054

THE EMERGENT ROLES OF THE TEACHER AND THE AUTHORITY STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL.

BY- BOYAN, NORMAN J.

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0252-3 PUB DATE APR 66
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-078
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.08 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *BOARD OF EDUCATION ROLE, *TEACHER ROLE, TEACHING CONDITIONS, COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, *SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL POLICY, ORGANIZATION, ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, BUREAUCRACY, *ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, TEACHER SALARIES, STANFORD

THE NEED FOR TWO SEPARATE STRUCTURES FOR TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL GOVERNMENT WAS DISCUSSED. THE FIRST STRUCTURE WOULD INVOLVE THE PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS AS MEMBERS OF EXTRA-SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLICY AND EXTRINSIC CONDITIONS OF WORK. THE SECOND STRUCTURE WOULD ENCOMPASS THE PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS AS PROFESSIONAL COLLEAGUES, IN THE ORGANIZATION, ON ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION MAKING IN EDUCATION AS AN EXPERT DOMAIN. THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES THAT ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS NEW APPROACH, BASED ON THE SEPARATION OF THE DECISION AREAS OF WORKING CONDITIONS AND SALARY FROM THE DECISION AREA OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, DEPENDS NOT ONLY ON WHAT COURSE TEACHERS THEMSELVES CHOOSE, BUT ALSO ON WHAT CHOICES ADMINISTRATORS AND BOARD MEMBERS OFFER. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, THE UCEA CAREER DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR (UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, APRIL 24-26, 1966). (GD)

AA000054

BR-5-0252-3
OEC-6-10-07
P.A. 24

THE EMERGENT ROLES OF THE TEACHER AND THE AUTHORITY STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

Norman J. Boyan
School of Education
Stanford University

A paper prepared for the UCEA Career Development Seminar on "Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration" at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, April 24 - 26, 1966.

ED011937

INTRODUCTION

The aspirations of teachers as professionals in public bureaucracies and the militant behavior of teachers as members of extra-school organizations have brought them into sharp confrontation with the traditional authority structure of the school. Teacher-administrator relationships in the authority structure have received little systematic attention from students of school organization. Role analysis represents a more established research tradition in education than structural analysis. As a result, investigators of teacher-administrator relationships have produced a more extensive literature on the congruence of role expectations, and on the congruence of organizational needs with personal needs, than on the distribution of organizational authority.

The differences between role analysis and structural analysis as modes of inquiry emerge neatly in a comparison of "The Social Background of Teaching" by Charters (1963) with "The School as a Formal Organization" by Bidwell (1965). Charters reviews in depth the theoretical literature and empirical investigations which have drawn on role analysis as their intellectual source. The place of the teacher in the authority structure of the school receives only passing attention. Bidwell also notes the contributions which the role analysts have made to the description of the school as a formal organization. However, he concludes that the conceptual and methodological tools of role analysts have produced only a meagre empirical literature on the place of the teacher in the authority structure of the school. Bidwell argues that understanding of the authority structure is crucial to understanding the behavior of teachers as professionals in public bureaucracies. It is also crucial to understanding the implications of the militant behavior of teachers as members of extra-school organizations.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE EMERGENT ROLES OF TEACHERS

Changes in teachers as individuals, changes affecting teachers as members of school organizations, changes in the external environment, and changes in the posture of extra-school organizations have all contributed to a new level of teacher confrontation with the authority structure of the school.

Two personal characteristics of today's teachers are salient. First, teachers bring to their work increased levels of preparation and expertise. The availability of new and enlarged public and private resources has spurred them to pursue continuous upgrading of their professional preparation. The opportunities to do so, especially in the national curriculum development programs and supporting institutes, has encouraged many teachers to turn outward from their school systems and to develop a stronger cosmopolitan, colleague-group orientation which feeds professional aspirations. Second, the ratio of the sexes in the teaching force has shifted dramatically. Men now constitute more than half the total number of all secondary-school teachers. They generally express themselves more vigorously than women on career and employment issues.

Reduction in the number of local school districts and the pupil population explosion have led to the growth of larger and more complex school systems. Size and organizational complexity tend to generate bureaucratic tendencies. Meanwhile, teachers have developed growing distaste for and have demonstrated growing disenchantment with authoritarian and paternalistic administration. Teachers, too, have heard the message on broadening the base of staff participation in educational decision-making and they have liked what they have heard. In addition, the introduction of structural rearrangements in school organization, such as team teaching and the employment of para-professionals, has

encouraged some teachers to assume expanded responsibilities for decision-making and most teachers to seek initial or additional relief from non-instructional tasks and activities.

Teachers have also felt the impact of powerful extra-organizational forces. The public at all levels has demonstrated its acceptance of the crucial role of education as an instrument of national policy. The new climate of public opinion has encouraged teachers to feel more confident that their work is important, to feel more justified in demanding greater recognition for their services, and to seek a more central seat at the educational decision-making table.

As members of extra-school organizations (both "professional association" and "union"), the behavior of teachers has shifted from relative docility to aggressive militancy. The contributing factors reside in themselves, in the school systems in which they work, and in the larger society in which they live. Part of their more militant behavior derives from personal desire and associational press to act more like professionals and to aspire to professional-level social and economic rewards. Part derives from the intense competition between professional association and union for membership and for exclusive recognition as bargaining or negotiating representative. Part, it is suspected, derives from the larger proportion of men who have entered teaching as a career and who are determined that they shall enjoy a rewarding career. Part, it is hypothesized, derives from a reaction to protect themselves from the militancy of attacks on schools and teachers from both the "hard right" and the "new left."

The cumulative effect of personal, intra-organizational, and extra-organizational factors has stimulated large numbers of teachers to seek, through extra-school organizations,

an expanded role in the government and governance of schools.[1] It is the search for this expanded role which has brought teachers into direct confrontation with the existing authority structure of schools. It is in this search that reside the critical implications for teacher-administrator relationships.

THE TEACHER IN THE AUTHORITY STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

Weber, the father of modern organizational analysis, defines authority as legitimated power. Legitimation refers to acceptability by subordinates of the exercise of power by superordinates, in particular the exercise of influence over organizational behavior. Contemporary students of formal organizations generally follow Weber's lead in their discussions of authority. Etzioni (1964, 1965), for example, relates the distribution of authority to the organizational need for control of behavior. Katz and Kahn (1966) speak of the authority structure as directly derivative of the inescapable organizational need to monitor the performance of members. Dornbusch and his associates (1965), in similar vein, locate evaluation as central to the distribution of authority. In the literature on educational organizations, Griffiths (1959) implies that the authority structure reflects the distribution of control over decision-making.[2]

[1] The author is indebted to W.H. Cowley, David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, Emiritus, Stanford University, for his insights on the distinction between educational government and governance.

[2] Not all students of formal organizations tie the distribution of authority directly to the need for control over behavior. Barnard lays the communication system of an organization as the cornerstone of its authority structure. See Hopkins (1964)

In the "ideal-type" bureaucracy, as described and advocated by Weber, the authority of position and the authority of competence coincide. Contemporary organizational analysts have noted, however, the potential for conflict between the authority of position and the authority of competence when the organizational "subordinate" performs complex, technical tasks. For example, Parsons (1958) observed that the articulation between managerial and technical levels in organizations suffers as the expertise of the technical personnel increases. The more expert (that is, professional) the technical personnel become, the more restive they become about managerial decisions concerning technical activities and about the competence of the managerial personnel to supervise technical performance.

Parsons has neatly identified the source of conflict between conventional bureaucratic authority and professional authority. Bureaucratic authority presumes a rational distribution of power over a hierarchy of positions in which incumbents of superordinate positions possess authority over subordinates. Professional authority, on the other hand, presumes a collegial, rather than a hierarchical, relationship in which the distribution of authority rests on demonstrated knowledge or competence.

> The source of discipline within a bureaucracy is not the colleague group but the hierarchy of authority. Performance is controlled by directives received from one's superiors rather than by self-imposed standards and peer-group surveillance, as is the case among professionals. This difference in social control, which is related to that between expertness and discipline....constitutes the basic distinguishing feature between professional and bureaucratic institutions, which have otherwise many similar characteristics. The significance of this difference is brought into sharp relief if one examines people who are subject to both forms of social control; that is,professionals in a bureaucracy." (Blau and Scott, 1962, p.63)[3]

[3]For a full treatment of the commonalities as well as differences between bureaucratic and professional orientations see Blau and Scott, pp.60-74.

Teachers as Aspirant Professionals in Public Bureaucracies

The traditional authority structure of the school includes a unique mix of administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority. Administrative authority, here, refers to the distribution of legitimated power to promulgate rules and regulations which govern the organizational behavior of members in general. Supervisory authority refers to the distribution of legitimated power to define and to assess the specific task performance of members of the organization. In schools, administrative officers have traditionally exercised both the administrative and the supervisory dimensions of authority. The administrative dimension of authority, however, rests on the social control of organizational discipline. The supervisory dimension of authority rests, presumably and hopefully, on the social control of expertness.

It is exactly at the points of difference between the social control of discipline and the social control of expertness that the emergent role of the teacher as an aspirant professional thrusts him into confrontation with the traditional authority structure of the school. The traditional structure assumes a differential in technical expertness between teachers and administrators that justifies merger of the authority of position and the authority of competence at the managerial level. When teachers perceive that the assumed differential narrows, vanishes, or reverses itself, they tend to challenge vigorously one of the foundations of the existing authority structure.

The challenge itself is not new (Lieberman, 1956). Becker (1953) reported that teachers recognized and desired to confirm (legitimate), the difference between administrative authority and supervisory authority. The Chicago public school teachers whom he interviewed strongly preferred the principal to work with them on a collegial basis

in matters of curriculum and instruction. At the same time, they wanted him to exercise his administrative authority to control pupil behavior and to regulate parental "interference." Other empirical studies of teacher-administrator relationships provide support for the distinction between administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority (Bidwell, 1956; Bush, 1962 ; Chase, 1952; Moyer, 1955; Sharma, 1955).

The sparse research literature on the teacher as a professional in a public bureaucracy supplies complementary evidence. Washburne (1957) concluded that the administrator either ignores or punishes professional behavior by the teacher. He also prophetically anticipated the development of teacher militancy arising from the lack of machinery for resolving the conflict of bureaucratic and professional authority. Corwin (1965), almost a decade later, observed that increased teacher professionalism tends to provoke teacher militancy because the demands for enlarged autonomy stimulate strong resistance from lay boards of education and administrators. He found that initiative-prone teachers were more professionally and less bureaucractically oriented than compliant teachers. They also exhibited consistently higher rates of conflict with the administrative authority structure of the school.

Moeller's report (1962) of the relationship between bureaucracy and teacher sense of power prompts the need for guarded generalization from the few studies available on the place of the teacher in the authority structure.[4] He did not find support for his central hypothesis that extent of bureaucracy varies inversely with teacher sense of power to affect policies and procedures. Contrary to his expectations, teachers in "high" bureaucracies reported higher sense of power over their own behavior than teachers in "low" bureaucracies. In addition, he found that teachers in "low" bureaucracies reported that they received closer supervision, which he attributed in part to a lower administrator-teacher ratio and in part

[4]See Neal Gross (1965, pp.162-163) for a treatment of professionals in the public school bureaucracy from the "executive" perspective.

to more active community interest in the schools.

Bidwell's (1965) extensive analysis of the school as a public bureaucracy confirms the need for sharper definition and more refined analysis of the teacher as an aspirant professional. He has identified the conditions in school systems which contribute to the development of bureaucratic orientations among administrators and which perpetuate a strain toward autonomy among teachers. Administrators must assume responsibility for coordinating the tasks and activities of personnel to insure the movement of cohorts of pupils through the public schools at a relatively uniform pace. Responsibility for coordination tends to produce bureaucratic orientations and behavior, such as reliance on general, impersonal directives from superordinates to subordinates. On the other hand, the "structural looseness" of school systems, derivative of the geographical decentralization of school units and isolated classrooms, tends to generate a pattern of relatively unsupervised teacher behavior, which supports and draws support from a professional norm in favor of teacher autonomy.

Mixed into the conditions which contribute to both bureaucratic reality and professional potentiality exists a common teacher orientation to develop affectively loaded rather than affectively neutral relationships with pupils. Bidwell attributes this tendency to personal, training, and experience biases among teachers which contradict both classical bureaucratic and classical professional norms. In sum, organizational purposes and personal characteristics of members create three distinct sets of orientations among school personnel: bureaucratic, near-professional, and excessively client-centered.

There exists a rough parallel between these orientations and the characteristics of teacher types proposed by Griffiths and his associates (1963) in their interview study of 1,000 New York City public school teachers. The investigators identified four categories: administrative aspirants (colloquially designated as GASers); pupil-oriented teachers; subject-

oriented teachers; and benefits-oriented teachers.

Whether the Bidwell and Griffiths typologies will stand the test of empirical replication remains moot. However, they prompt properly cautious acceptance of the assumptions that all teachers are aspirant professionals or that there is a neat dichotomy between bureaucratic and professional orientations. It is more defensible to assume that teachers vary over a wide range in their commitment to professional norms (classically defined) and in their reactions to the exercise of administrative and supervisory authority. These assumptions, in turn, require specific identification of the points where the sub-group of aspirant professionals confronts the traditional authority structure of the school. To date, the confrontation has focussed on achieving two aspirations. The first is establishing an acceptable or collegial base of participation in decision-making on education as an expert endeavor. This aspiration directs itself to construction and legitimation of a pattern of school government in which teachers participate as equal partners with administrators and governing boards on the basis of their technical expertness. The second aspiration springs from challenge to the competence of administrators to assess teaching performance. Here, the level and direction of aspiration represents an attack on the status quo more than a proposal for reconstruction. Classical professional orientations include not only a preference for collegial participation in reaching decisions on technical activities. They also include a willingness and a determination to achieve self-control through strong voluntary associations and external surveillance by "peers who are in a position to see his /the practitioner's/ work, who have the skills to judge his performance, and who, since they have a personal stake in the reputation of their profession, are motivated to exercise the necessary sanctions." (Blau and Scott, 1962, p.63)

Teachers have rarely proposed that self-regulation of performance be substituted

for hierarchical assessment of performance. They have traditionally preferred substitution of the principle of seniority, tied to years of teaching experience and level of preparation, to any system of relating rewards to qualitative assessment of performance. The principle of seniority does not, however, meet the test of classical professional criteria.

The ambivalence of teachers on the issue of self-regulation threatens to slow, if not undermine, the drive toward professional status represented by aggressive claims for greater economic rewards, social prestige, and participation in school government. The same ambivalence casts its shadow on acceptable reconstruction of the supervisory dimension of the school's authority structure. Despite the strain toward autonomy and relatively unsupervised teacher behavior which has characterized schools, governing boards and administrators will resist formal discontinuation of hierarchical supervision unless a viable alternative is substituted. The discontinuity between teachers' professional aspirations for enlarged participation in decision-making on education as an expert endeavor and their reluctance to assume greater responsibility for self-regulation as professionals generates continuous tension in teacher-administrator relationships.

Teachers as Members of Militant Extra-School Organizations

Teachers as employees share a number of beliefs with teachers as aspirant professionals. First, they express concern about the wisdom of administrators in the exercise of administrative authority. Their aspirations on this score center on restricting through contractual agreement the arbitrary exercise of administrative authority. They also appear determined to monitor administrator behavior through provision for public processing of grievances.

Second, teachers in general express their restiveness about the competence of

of administrators to exercise supervisory authority. Their aspirations on this score center on restricting the rights of and opportunities for administrators to assess teaching performance and to make decisions on teacher assignments which are related to qualitative assessment. These aspirations are typically complemented by searching behavior designed to expand the boundaries of teacher autonomy and/or to expand the base of collegial participation in decisions on educational policies and procedures.

Teachers in general also share aspirations for relief from non-instructional chores, ranging from yard and lunch duty to clerical work, and for establishing equitable bases to determine load and assignments. They also share restiveness over their ability to improve their status in the organization through conventional organizational machinery.

In addition, teachers want greater economic rewards for their services. They want the higher social status and prestige which come with higher salary. They wish to protect the "in-group" from outside attack, to which the educational establishment has been submitted in the last two decades. They also desire to protect their rights to seek the most favorable conditions of work, including opportunities for mobility and transfer to more "desirable" teaching locations.

Teachers have expressed their aspirations most militantly through their membership in extra-school organizations. Their collective action through extra-school organizations has also challenged the traditional authority structure of schools, in both its administrative and supervisory dimensions. The challenge poses questions not only for teacher-administrator relationships but also for the tripartite relationships of governing boards, administrative officers, and teachers. As members of militant extra-school organizations teachers question the wisdom of administrator exercise of administrative authority and administrator competence to exercise supervisory authority. They also question the whole of the existing authority

structure and its limitations on their opportunities to influence decisions on all organizational matters, not just decisions on educational program. Their aspirations as employees are more diffuse and global than their aspirations as professionals. The diffuseness and the universal extent of their goals, and the methods of collective action which they have chosen to achieve these goals, represent strategic advantages in their confrontation with the traditional authority structure of the school. Governing boards and administrators appear confused about what teachers really want and appear even more confused by the power play which the militant teacher organizations have initiated.

Teacher Militancy and
"Power Equalization"

The collective, militant action of teachers as employees in public bureaucracies represents their search to achieve "power equalization" in schools and school systems. Leavitt (1965) provides a provocative and enlightening treatment of power-equalization in his analysis of the sources of organizational change. He identifies the influence of technology, of structural reorganization, and the "people-changers" on the introduction of changes in organizational tasks. The people changers fall into two groups: the manipulators and the power-equalizers. Leavitt describes at length the position, strategies, and tactics of the advocates of power-equalization, such as MacGregor. However, he also notes the possibility of introducing power-equalization in organizations through involuntary as well as voluntary means. The collective action of unions, he suggests, represents one "involuntary" way of achieving power-equalization in industry and business.

The drive of teacher organizations to establish agreements with local boards for collective bargaining or professional negotiations fits the characteristics of involuntary power-equalization. Central to the achievement of power-equalization through collective

action is securing the right, as a right, for greater participation by teachers in organizational decision-making which has traditionally been the preserve of the administration and governing board. The drive for greater participation in decision-making, moreover, goes beyond the boundaries of education as an expert endeavor. It encompasses employment conditions which are not unique to education.

The primary intellectual and philosophical tool available to governing boards and school administrators for extending voluntary power-equalization is the classical participation hypothesis. (Golembiewski, 1965; Leavitt, 1965) It is misleading, however, to equate classical participation with the kind and degree of participation which teacher organizations seek through collective bargaining or professional negotiations. Collective bargaining agreements pursued by teacher unions and "Level III" agreements advocated by the N.E.A. contain two singular extensions beyond the boundaries encompassed in conventionally-based participation.

First, teacher organizations seek to establish participation in organizational decision-making as a right, supported in law, as distinct from a permissive opportunity extended by governing boards and/or administrators. Second, and more significant, teacher organizations seek to establish provision for third-party involvement when their elected representatives and the legally constituted officials of the organization reach an impasse. Classical advocacy of teacher participation in school government makes no provision for the possibility of impasse. The more conventional approach envisions the participation of the professional staff and board in policy development, the enactment of policy by the board, and the execution of policy by the board's executive and professional staff. Both collective bargaining and professional negotiations anticipate a blurring of the usually sharp demarcation between the development and enactment of policy. For example, should the elected representatives of the teacher organization and board negotiators reach an impasse on salary, the right of the board to

make a final decision would be restricted by referral to a third-party.

Referral of policy decisions to external third-parties threatens to encroach significantly on the power traditionally vested in local boards of education. It also threatens the balance of power previously held by the administrative staff, which has often constituted the third-party in consultations between teachers and boards of education.

Generally, militant teacher organizations prefer to negotiate directly with boards of education, to by-pass the administrative hierarchy. The reason is simple enough. Representatives of teacher organizations desire to negotiate with representatives of boards who possess the authority to make agreements. The determination of teachers to reach the board directly may, in turn, drive the administrative hierarchy into a more clearly defined "managerial" and executive posture. Teachers unions, on the whole, seem to care little about such a consequence. Professional associations, on the other hand, reveal greater ambivalence on this score. Their ambivalence exposes itself in typical preambles which stipulate the "identity of interest" which teacher and administrators "as professional educators" share with each other.

"Power-equalization" and the Teacher
in the School Authority Structure

The search for power-equalization touches the administrative dimension of authority where teacher organizations seek greater control over the rules and regulations which govern their behavior as employees, over working conditions, and over salary. There is some question as to whether increase in teacher power will automatically result in less power for governing boards and their administrative officers. (Ohm and Mmahan, 1965) Tannenbaum (1965), for example, suggests that the "power-pie" is variable, not fixed. He argues that the power of both managers and workers in industry has expanded as a result of collective bargaining agreements.

It is too early in the history of collective action by teachers to support or reject the Tannenbaum thesis. It is not too early, however, to observe that the collective action of teachers aims to alter the conventional authority structure of schools through increased teacher participation in determining the rules and regulations which govern their organizational behavior.

Equally important to teachers acting in concert is securing the right to monitor the administration of these rules and regulations at the level of the individual school unit, as well as at the level of the school system. Contracts, or written agreements, typically provide for grievance procedures and machinery which permit the teacher to expose publicly the performance of administrators who violate, in the teachers' judgment, the intent or the letter of the agreement.

It is at the point of participating in determining rules and regulations and in monitoring administrative performance that the teacher confronts the traditional authority of the school principal. The principal anticipates no relaxation of the level of responsibility set for him by his superordinates. Yet, he sees teachers' gaining and exercising the right to participate in determining the rules and regulations which he is expected to administer. He also sees their gaining and exercising the right to monitor and to expose his administrative performance while his right to monitor their performance threatens to evaporate. That principals are vexed and perplexed is not surprising. They are, more than ever, "men in the middle." They have reacted by signalling their own intention to gain, by collective action if necessary, a more central place in determining the rules and regulations which they must administer. The collective action of principals, stimulated and supported by the collective action of teachers, represents another alteration of the traditional authority of schools brought on by the emergent roles of teachers.

The relationship of power-equalization to the supervisory dimension of authority is more complex than its relationship to the administrative dimension of authority. Here, the critical elements are establishment of stronger collegial relationships in determination of the educational program and reconstruction of the system for regulation and assessment of teacher performance. The crucial question is whether or not the posture of teacher-employee on power equalization will completely overwhelm the posture of teacher-professional. Teacher-employee and teacher-professional agree on the need for redefining the authority structure of the school and teacher-administrator relationships. However, their agreement masks the need for adopting different strategies to reconstruct the administrative dimension of authority and the supervisory dimension of authority. Militant, collective action may well be required to initiate change in both dimensions. Once the change is initiated, the opportunity must be available to pursue uniquely professional aspirations through compatible organizational structure and machinery. The point may be illustrated through re-examination of the issue of self-regulation and assessment of performance.

The more extreme posture of teacher organizations is that teaching is so complex a set of technical behaviors that it resists objective assessment, especially by generalist administrators and supervisors. Therefore, a straightforward seniority system is preferable to any system which attempts to relate material or status rewards to judged performance. Indeed, the group norm on this score is so strong that administrators and supervisors generally support the position of teacher organizations. The only exception is agreement among teachers and administrators that the latter will, and must, assume responsibility for decisions on retention or dismissal of teachers during the probationary period and on advancement to tenure.

However, the strong sentiment for the institutionalization of seniority as the central measure of teacher differentiation threatens in the long run to blunt the edge of teacher

aspirations for professional status. One of the major tenets of professionalism, mentioned earlier, is peer regulation of technical performance. Substitution of a seniority principle for hierarchically-based supervision on the grounds that the authority of competence rarely coincides with the authority of position does not represent a professionally viable alternative.

A strong collegial supervisory structure, unequivocally based on the authority of the competence of senior colleagues rather than the authority of administrative position, represents a preferred alternative. It also represents an alternative which can contribute to the amelioration of conflict between teachers and administrators on the issue of assessment of performance. The structural specifics include extension into an interstitial level, between the technical and managerial levels, of senior teacher colleagues whose expertise is accepted by their peers (See Bidwell, 1965; Parsons, 1958).

Surrender for less by governing boards, administrators, and <u>teachers themselves</u> threatens to undermine the future of teaching as a mature profession and of teachers as responsible professionals. For their responsibility, in the supervisory dimension of authority, goes beyond gaining and exercising the right to participate on a collegial basis with administrators in decisions on curriculum and instruction. Their responsibility includes, eventually, acceptance of the basic professional criterion of self-regulation of technical performance. Their collective action, as employees outside the organization, must provide for this alternative <u>within</u> the structure of the organization if they are to achieve their professional aspirations.

Separation of TeacherParticipation in the
Administrative and Supervisory Dimensions of Authority

Wildman (1965) has observed that the search for power-equalization in schools through standard patterns of collective negotiations may lead to institutionalization of conflict between teachers on the one hand and governing boards and administrators on the other hand.

Collective bargaining assumes that the parties involved are adversaries, that there exist inherent conflicts between managers and employees, and that struggle for power characterizes the relationship.. In addition, each party must possess sufficient power to inflict injury on the other if it is to press its demands with effect. (See Tannenbaum, 1965)

Griffiths (in press) has proposed that one way to divert the institutionalization of conflict is to separate the decision areas of working conditions and salary from the decision area of educational program development. The separation he advocates would permit administrators to serve as executives of governing boards when negotiating with teachers on matters of salary and conditions of work, in the extrinsic sense, and at the same time would encourage preservation of professional identity in deciding on matters of curriculum and instruction.

In essence, Griffiths proposes the establishment of unique patterns of teacher-administrator participation in the administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority. In the administrative dimension the administrator would unequivocally assume a position differentiated by hierarchical authority. In the supervisory authority structure, the administrator would attempt to establish a collegial leadership role based on the authority of competence.

The need for two separate structures for teacher participation in school government is compelling. The first would encompass the participation of teachers as members of extra-school associations in the development of organizational policy on salaries and extrinsic conditions of work. The second would encompass the participation of teachers as professional colleagues, in the organization, on organizational decision-making in education as an expert domain. The first would permit teacher involvement via a bargaining or negotiations model in the development of organizational legislation addressed to general

employment conditions. The second would extend the classical participatory model to include the right, as a right, of teachers to participate in organizational decisions on educational program.

The relevance of the separation becomes especially critical at the point of third-party involvement. If there is only one structure of school government, if this structure rests on the base of conventional industrial bargaining, if third-party involvement is provided for the resolution of impasse as an alternative to withholding of services (strike), then it follows that third parties who themselves may not possess the authority of educational competence will make educational, as well as employment, decisions. Only by separating decision-making on educational policy from decision-making on employment conditions can this intolerable consequence be avoided.

"Conditions of employment" cuts into both the spheres of participation in organizational legislation by teachers as employees and teachers as professional colleagues. The assignment of a particular condition to one domain or the other may be moot. However, the very possibility that discussion on a given condition of employment may be referred to the bargaining table promises to encourage full "voluntary" review and consideration. At the same time, initial assignment of problematical conditions of employment to the "voluntary" sector promises to permit more flexibility of discussion and freer application of technical expertise.

In his analysis of the need for separating the administrative and the supervisory dimensions of authority, Griffiths explicitly cites the hospital analogy. The university analog is also apt. In the university, the administrator and the professor appear able to separate their administrative and their supervisory relationships. Furthermore, professors appear able to participate at various levels of militancy in local and national AAUP drives for improved salaries and working conditions while they participate as independent professionals in local faculty senates or academic councils.

Unfortunately, the past history of teacher participation in school government and governance has produced neither the ideology nor the machinery for separating decision-making on the administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority. Whether it is too late to establish a new historical tradition in the public schools which enables teachers to participate as members of militant extra-organizational associations in negotiating on salary and working conditions and to participate as professional partners in the determination of educational programs depends not only on what course teachers themselves choose, but also on what alternatives administrators and board members offer. Therefore, governing boards and administrators should take the lead in establishing and maintaining two separate structures for teachers to participate in school government. Without such an alternative teachers may turn increasingly to extra-school organizations to press for participation in school government and governance through bargining or negotiating agreements based on the experience of private industry. In this connection, action by associations of governing boards and administrators, as well as teachers, at the state level is also critical. Unless legislators recognize the need for the two separate structures of school government, each restricted to its unique sphere of organizational policy, they may indiscriminately project the machinery and procedures of private sector bargaining into education. If they do so, they may well contribute irreversibly to the institutionalization of conflict between teachers on one hand and governing boards and administrators on the other. It is this potential conflict which constitutes the overriding implication for teacher-administrator relations of the emergent roles of teachers.

SUMMARY

The implications for teacher-administrator relations of the emergent roles of teachers center on the authority structure of the school. Teachers as individuals, and the teaching force

as a group, have become more expert. Teachers are, in general, better educated than they were in previous years. They have found new strength in their local teacher organizations, a phenomenon related in part to the intra-fraternity competition between the A.F.T. and N.E.A. for membership and exclusive representation. They have been encouraged by new patterns of public and private support for continuous technical upgrading to look more to their colleague groups than to their hierarchical superordinates as relevant reference groups. They have also begun to take seriously the exhortation of students of school administration to participate more vigorously in local educational decision-making. Because as individuals and as members of increasingly powerful organizations they are no longer the same, they have launched the search for a new pattern of teacher-administrator relations.

The aspirations of teachers have prompted them to search for a new level of involvement in the government and governance of schools. In the former instance, their aspirations include the establishment of the right rather than the sufferance to participate in decisions concerning the allocation of public resources to education and also in decisions concerning the distribution of resources within the school system. In the latter instance, they are attempting to place publicly-exposed boundary conditions on the legitimated power of administrative personnel. In both instances, they have projected demands for involuntary power-equalization; involuntary, in the sense that governing boards and the administrative hierarchy have generally not assumed the initiative in extending the right for teachers to do so.

The flexing of new-found muscle will bring aggravation both to governing boards and to school administrators. In addition, the intra-fraternity struggle between the A.F.T. and the N.E.A. will prompt the introduction of issues which the leaders of the respective organizations see as functional to their competition for membership and exclusive representation. Here, even the best-intentioned boards of education and administrators will find

themselves in extremely difficult circumstances.

Furthermore, the usual excesses associated with early revolutionary activities will develop. Boards of education and administrators will ask teachers as individuals and as members of organizations when and how they propose to assume the self-regulatory responsibility which goes with the new place which they will seek, and win, in the authority structure of the school. Teachers will tend to be impatient with questions of this order, however crucial the questions may be to achievement of full professional status.

As for the administrator, he must take the lead in establishing new structures of school government which separate participation in the administrative authority structure from the supervisory authority structure. It is here that he can make his unique contribution to the resolution of hardening of conflict in teacher-administrator relations.

References

Becker, H.S.. The teacher in the authority system of the public school. J. educ. Sociol, 1953, 27, 128-141.

Bidwell, C.E., Administration and teacher satisfaction. Phi Delta Kappan, 1956, 37, pp.285-88.

Bidwell, C.E. The school as a formal organization. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of Organization. Cnicago: Rand McNally, 1965. Pp.972-1022.

Blau, P.M., & Scott, W.R. Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bush, R.N. Teaching and administrative roles. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford Univer.,1962.

Charters, W.W., Jr. The social background of teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp.715-813.

Chase, F.S. The teacher and policy making. Administrator's Notebook, 1952, 1, No.3.

Corwin, R.G. Militant professionalism, initiative and compliance in public education. Sociol. of Educ., 1965, 38, pp.310-31.

Dornbusch, S.M., et. al. Evaluation and authority. Unpublished paper, Laboratory for Social Research, Stanford Univer., 1965.

Etzioni, A. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Etzioni, A. Organizational control structure. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Cnicago: Rand McNally, 1965. Pp. 650-677.

Griffiths, D.E. Administrative theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Griffiths, D.E. et. al. Teacher mobility in New York City. New York: School of Education, New York Univer., 1963.

Griffiths, D.E. Viable alternatives to the status quo. In F.W. Lutz and J. Azzarelli (Eds.), The struggle for power in education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, in press.

Golembiewski, R.T. Small groups and large organizations. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, Pp.87-141.

Hopkins, T.K. Bureaucratic authority: the convergence of Weber and Barnard. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), Complex organizations: a sociological reader. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Leavitt, H.J. Applied organizational change in industry: structural, technological, and humanistic approaches. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, Pp.1144-70.

Lieberman, M. Education as a profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Moeller, G. Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power. Administrators Notebook, 1962, 11, No. 3.

Moyer, D.C. Leadership that teachers want. Administrators Notebook, 1955. 3, No. 7.

Ohm, R.E., & Monahan, W.G. Power and stress in organizational response to collective action. in R.E.Ohm and O.D.Johns (Eds.), Negotiations in the schools. Norman: Coll. of Educ., Univer. of Oklahoma, 1965. Pp.71-6.

Sharma, G.L. Who should make what decisions? Administrators Notebook, 1955, 3, No.8.

Tannenbaum, A.S. Unions. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, Pp. 710-63.

Washburne, C. Teacher in the authority system. J. educ. Sociol., 1957, 30, 390-394.

Wildman, W.A. Teacher collective action in the United States. In R.E. Ohm and O.D.Johns (Eds.) Negotiations in the schools. Norman: Coll. of Educ., Univer. of Oklahoma, 1965. Pp.20-34.

JUL 18 1967